



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,831	03/31/2004	Dan Zhang	CS23995RL	6501
20280 7590 06/28/2010 MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 W4 - 39Q LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			EXAMINER HERRERA, DIEGO D	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/28/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/814,831

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

DIEGO HERRERA

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, and 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 3/25/2010 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because correspondence between the office and applicant is not prior art or publication. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Response to Amendment

Specification has been amended, no new matter discovered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/30/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicants arguments and remarks, wherein claims 1-18 discloses pre-empting or overriding an active packet session with an event, suspending operation of a dormancy timer, re-starting the suspended dormancy timer upon completion of event that triggered the pre-empting the active packet session, reads on Kuusinen et al. and Misra et al. cited prior art references.

In further reading of Kuusinen et al. the primary references teaches in paragraphs 35-37, wherein the paragraphs teach that the transmission of

packets/messages was terminated as the terminal switched to the suspend state and that the retransmission timer off when it switched to the suspend state, it now switches the timer on when it switches back from the circuit-switched service to the packet-switched service. Therefore, it reads on the limitations of the claims mentioned above as there's a suspension of packet-switched services in session and another service, for example circuit-switched service, is used; after the service is concluded the packet-switched service is restarted or resumed. Therefore, the claims are reasonably broad that the cited prior art reference of Kuusinen and Misra read on the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuusinen et al. (EP 1161036 A1), and in view of Misra et al. (US 20040022209A1).

Regarding claim 1. a method in a wireless communications device (fig. 4, terminal shown by Kuusinen et al.), the method comprising:
pre-empting an active packet session with an event (abstract, ¶: 21, Kuusinen et al. discloses managing between packet services and circuit switch services suspending the state of the packet services in progress);
suspending operation of a dormancy timer initiated upon pre-emption of the active packet session (abstract, ¶:29-32, Kuusinen et al. teaches suspending dormancy state);
re-starting the suspended dormancy timer upon completion of either a service (abstract, ¶: 29-30, 35-38, Kuusinen et al. teaches starting suspending dormancy state upon the operation or service of the circuit switched operation mode has been fulfilled) or Kuusinen et al. may teach application associated with the event pre-empting the active packet session; nevertheless, Misra et al. is used to explain known method of VPOPD (abstract, fig. 2, Misra et al. teaches wherein the voice call precedence over packet data technique is used, hence preempting the active packet session do to a voice

application). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was use to specifically include a technique to preempt an active packet session as taught by Misra et al. for the purposes of preventing race conditions (abstract).

Regarding claim 7. a method in a wireless communications device (fig. 4, terminal shown by Kuusinen et al.), the method comprising:
pre-empting an active packet session with an event (abstract, ¶: 21, Kuusinen et al. discloses managing between packet services and circuit switch services suspending the state of the packet services in progress);
suspending initiation of a dormancy timer that would otherwise be initiated after pre-emption of the packet session (abstract, ¶: 29-30, 35-38, Kuusinen et al. teaches starting suspending dormancy state upon the operation or service of the circuit switched operation mode has been fulfilled);
initiating the suspended dormancy timer upon completion of either a service (abstract, ¶: 29-30, 35-38, Kuusinen et al. teaches starting suspending dormancy state upon the operation or service of the circuit switched operation mode has been fulfilled) or Kuusinen et al. may teach application associated with the event pre-empting the active packet session; nevertheless, Misra et al. is used to explain known method of VPOPD (abstract, fig. 2, Misra et al. teaches wherein the voice call precedence over packet data technique is used, hence preempting the active packet session do to a voice application). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was use to specifically include a technique to preempt an active

packet session as taught by Misra et al. for the purposes of preventing race conditions (abstract).

Regarding claim 13. a method in a wireless communications device (fig. 4, terminal shown by Kuusinen et al.), the method comprising:

receiving a network control message (¶: 26-29, Kuusinen et al. teaches control message of TCP/IP is sent to the mobile terminal, mobile terminal receiving message to switch from current packet session to that of circuit switch application);
suspending an active packet session of the wireless communication device in response to receiving the network control message (abstract, ¶:29-32, Kuusinen et al. teaches suspending dormancy state);
suspending a dormancy timer after receiving the network control message (¶: 26-29, Kuusinen et al. teaches control message of TCP/IP is sent to the mobile terminal, suspending dormancy state).

Consider claim 2. The method of Claim 1, resuming the pre-empted packet session upon expiration of the dormancy timer after re-starting the dormancy timer (abstract, title, fig. 2, ¶:35-37, Kuusinen et al. teaches about restarting the time on after the suspended state is over, resuming to packet session).

Consider claim 3. The method of Claim 1, receiving a network control message with dormancy timer information before suspending the dormancy timer (¶: 26-28, Kuusinen et al. teaches TCP/IP for the packet and circuit connection).

Consider claim 4. The method of Claim 3, starting the dormancy timer after receiving the network control message (¶: 26-28, Kuusinen et al. teaches TCP/IP for the packet and circuit connection).

Consider claim 5. The method of Claim 1, pre-empting the active packet session with a pending voice call (abstract, title, ¶: 10-11, 15, 20; Misra et al. teaches having a voice call precedence over packet data method);
re-starting the suspended dormancy timer upon completion of the voice call associated with pre-empting the packet session (¶: 21, Misra et al. teaches restarting packet session).

Consider claim 6. The method of Claim 5, receiving a page, conducting the voice call after receiving the page (fig. 2, Misra et al. shows in step 220, 225, and 230 preprocessing to determine whether to accept call...then steps 240, 245, and 255 show process of setting up call and completing call afterwards reestablishing packet data session).

Consider claim 8. The method of Claim 7, resuming the pre-empted packet session upon expiration of the dormancy timer initiated upon completion of the service or application associated with the event pre-empting the active packet session (¶: 21, Misra et al. teaches restarting packet session).

Consider claim 9. The method of Claim 7, receiving a network control message with dormancy timer information before suspending the dormancy timer (¶: 26-28, Kuusinen et al. teaches TCP/IP for the packet and circuit connection).

Consider claim 10. The method of Claim 9, starting the dormancy timer after receiving the network control message (¶: 26-28, Kuusinen et al. teaches TCP/IP for the packet and circuit connection).

Consider claim 11. The method of Claim 7, pre-empting the active packet session with a pending voice call (abstract); re-starting the suspended dormancy timer upon completion of the voice call associated with pre-empting the packet session(¶: 21, Misra et al. teaches restarting packet session).

Consider claim 12. The method of Claim 11, receiving a page, conducting the voice call after receiving the page (abstract, ¶: 3, 20, Misra et al. teaches suspending packet data session when MSC sends a Prevent Race Condition message to the mobile, hence, starting voice call session and when the mobile paged).

Consider claim 15. The method of Claim 13, receiving a page after receiving the network control message, conducting a voice call after receiving the page, and resuming the suspended dormancy timer after completing the voice call (¶: 3, 21, Misra et al. teaches restarting packet session after ending voice call).

Consider claim 16. The method of Claim 13, suspending the dormancy timer includes suspending initiation of the dormancy timer otherwise started upon suspending the active packet session (¶: 26-28, Kuusinen et al. teaches TCP/IP for the packet and circuit connection).

Consider claim 17. The method of Claim 13, suspending the dormancy timer includes suspending operation of a dormancy timer after the dormancy timer has started (abstract, fig. 2, Kuusinen et al. teaches suspending dormancy state).

Consider claim 18. The method of Claim 13, starting the dormancy timer upon completion of an event precipitating the suspension of the active packet session (abstract, title, fig. 2, ¶¶:35-37, Kuusinen et al. teaches about restarting the time on after the suspended state is over).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIEGO HERRERA whose telephone number is (571)272-0907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Diego Herrera/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/LESTER KINCAID/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617